

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Foster Parent Training (DHFS -- Children and Family Services and Supportive Living)

[LFB Summary: Page 315, #12]

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) is required to develop a foster care education program to provide specialized training for persons operating treatment foster homes. By rule, treatment foster parents are required to participate in a minimum of 18 hours of orientation and training related to the general care and support needs of the children to be placed in the home prior to being licensed. Further, treatment foster parents are required to participate in a minimum of 24 hours of ongoing training in the second year of being licensed, and 18 hours of training for every subsequent year of licensure. Training programs for treatment foster parents must be approved by DHFS.

On a county-by-county basis, some training may be available on a voluntary basis for foster parents caring for children with special needs, and other counties and private child welfare agencies may require foster parent training prior to licensing or prior to receiving a child in their home. DHFS currently distributes \$30,900 to make training available to foster parents across the state.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$69,000 (\$43,000 GPR and \$26,000 FED) in 1997-98 and \$138,000 (\$86,000 GPR and \$52,000 FED) in 1998-99 for voluntary training of foster parents who care for children with special needs.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. A child with special needs is defined, by rule, as a child who requires more than the usual amount of care and supervision for the child's age because of special emotional, behavioral and physical needs. In December, 1994, approximately 70% of the children in foster care were considered children with special needs. Foster parents need to be able to accommodate these needs to ensure the safety and well-being of children in their care.

2. SB 77 would provide funding for training that would be available on a voluntary basis to foster parents who care for children with special needs. The amount of funding in the bill assumes that one parent in 50% of the foster families would elect to participate in training. The funding in the bill would be sufficient to support special needs training to approximately 600 foster parents in 1997-98 and 1,200 foster parents in 1998-99.

Foster parents would be able to receive training specific to the needs of their foster child. Likely topics covered include: (a) medical care; (b) developmental disability; (c) cognitive disability; (d) and the requirements of children with special needs.

3. Training funded by SB 77 would be available to foster parents caring for children with special needs in all counties except Milwaukee County, since DHFS has budgeted for training in Milwaukee County under a separate item in the Governor's budget relating to the state's takeover of child welfare activities in Milwaukee County beginning January 1, 1998.

4. DHFS staff indicate that this provision was not intended to address a specific concern over the quality of care for children in foster care. Instead, this item is designed to address a need identified by foster parents that they require training to support their efforts to provide care to children with special needs. It could be argued that if foster parents' needs for training go unmet, the state and counties may not be able to retain the current population of available foster parents.

5. However, making training available for foster parents who care for special needs children may not increase the pool of potential foster parents for children with special needs, since many people believe that the level of foster care payments are not commensurate with the services foster parents provide, and that individuals willing to care for children with special needs would do so regardless of whether training were available.

6. Under Title IV-E of the federal Social Security Act, states are reimbursed for 75% of the costs of providing training for foster parents. The funding in SB 77 should be reestimated to reflect that 75% of the costs provided will be supported with federal Title IV-E funds.

HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES

Foster Parent Training

Motion:

Move to provide \$69,000 (\$43,000 GPR and \$26,000 FED) in 1997-98 and \$138,000 (\$86,000 GPR and \$52,000 FED) in 1998-99 for DHFS to provide voluntary training of foster parents who care for children with special needs. Specify that total funding provided for this training shall not exceed \$69,000 in 1997-98 and \$138,000 in 1998-99. In the event that federal funds are more than anticipated under this item, GPR funding shall lapse by a corresponding amount.

Note:

This motion would maintain funding provided in SB 77 for this purpose.

MO# 1702

JENSEN	X	N	A
ZOURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	X	N	A
BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	X	N	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Modify the Governor's recommendations to provide funding for training for foster parents of children with special needs to reflect that 75% of these costs will be supported with federal funds.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>FED</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$77,000	\$77,000	\$0

2. Delete the Governor's provision.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>FED</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$129,000	- \$78,900	- \$207,900

Prepared by: Rachel Cissne

*See Motion #1702
replaces AH #1*

MO# _____

JENSEN Y N A
 OURADA Y N A
 HARSDORF Y N A
 ALBERS Y N A
 GARD Y N A
 KAUFERT Y N A
 LINTON Y N A
 COGGS Y N A

BURKE Y N A
 DECKER Y N A
 GEORGE Y N A
 JAUCH Y N A
 WINEKE Y N A
 SHIBILSKI Y N A
 COWLES Y N A
 PANZER Y N A

AYE _____ NO _____ ABS _____

HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES

Transfer of the Foster Grandparent Program

Motion:

Move to delete the transfer of funding and staff for the foster grandparent program from the Division of Supportive Living (DSL) to the Division of Children and Family Services (DCFS). Delete \$30,600 PR annually and the conversion of 1.0 FED position in DSL to 1.0 PR position, beginning in 1997-98, to retain the foster grandparent program in DSL.

Note:

The foster grandparent program is currently administered in the Bureau on Aging in DSL. SB 77 would transfer funding for the foster grandparent program from the DSL to DCFS. Beginning in 1997-98, 1.0 FED position would be transferred to DCFS and 1.0 FED position in DSL would be converted to a 1.0 PR position that would remain in DSL, but funded from DCFS.

The foster grandparent program enrolls low-income elderly persons as volunteers and places them in schools, child care centers, state institutions and Head Start programs to serve children with special needs.

[Change to Bill: -\$61,200 PR and -1.0 PR position and 1.0 FED position]

MO# 3103

JENSEN	X	N	A
2 LOURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	X	N	A

BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
/GEORGE	X	N	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

Motion #3103

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS _____

To: Joint Committee on Finance
From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Special Needs Adoption Services (DHFS -- Children and Family Services and Supportive Living)

[LFB Summary: Page 315, #13]

CURRENT LAW

Milwaukee County is responsible for providing out-of-home-care for children from Milwaukee County whose parental rights have been terminated and are determined to have special needs. Further, Milwaukee County provides adoption services such as recruitment, orientation and study of prospective adoptive families for these children. For children from the remainder of the state, the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) is responsible for providing these services.

Federal funding available under Title IV-E of the federal Social Security Act reimburses states for 50% of the costs of providing adoption services for children from homes eligible for the aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) program.

Prior to the finalization of an adoption, a study of the potential adoptive home is required. For foster families who wish to adopt their foster child, the home study generally requires six months to complete. Studies of new potential adoptive homes generally require twelve months.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$50,000 (\$31,000 GPR and \$19,000 FED) annually for DHFS to study potential adoptive homes outside of the southeastern region of the state that intend to adopt children with special needs from Milwaukee County.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The funding that would be provided in SB 77 would enable DHFS to study potential adoptive homes for children from Milwaukee County that are in areas outside of Milwaukee County and surrounding counties. Milwaukee County does not currently conduct home studies in these areas, even though children from Milwaukee County are placed in outstate foster homes. In many instances, these children are relatives of foster families with whom these children live.
2. The amount of funding in the bill is based on bids received from two providers in Milwaukee County to conduct home studies. Based on these bids and the funding in SB 77, it is estimated that DHFS could conduct 19 home studies annually.
3. Approximately 50 children from Milwaukee County live in foster homes outside of the southeastern region of the state. For some of these children, adoption by their foster family may be appropriate. However, because Milwaukee County has not budgeted funds to conduct home studies for these children, the children continue to live in foster homes. In addition, DHFS staff are aware of two families outside of the southeastern region of the state that have indicated a desire to adopt a total of five children who are in foster care in Milwaukee County. This funding could be used to conduct home studies for these types of cases.
4. Completion of home studies for these children would: (a) allow the county, or, beginning January 1, 1988, the state, to finalize adoptions for these children; (b) transfer the costs of caring for these children from foster care to adoption assistance, upon satisfactory completion of a home study; and (c) provide permanency to these children and families.
5. If the Committee chooses to fund home studies for these children, the funding provided in SB 77 should be reestimated to be \$25,000 GPR and \$25,000 FED annually to reflect that federal cost sharing is available on a 50% GPR/50% FED basis, rather than 62% GPR/38% FED basis, as provided in SB 77.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Modify the Governor's recommendations to reflect a 50% federal share for studying potential adoptive homes for children with special needs from Milwaukee County.

<u>Alternative</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>FED</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	-\$12,000	\$12,000	\$0

2. Delete the provision.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>FED</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$62,000	- \$38,000	- \$100,000

Prepared by: Rachel Cissne

MO#

A14 #1

ZJENSEN	X	N	A
OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	X	N	A

BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	X	N	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Transfer Community Intervention Program (DHFS -- Children and Family Services and Supportive Living, Corrections -- Juvenile Corrections)

[LFB Summary: Page 195, #5, Page 316, #14]

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Corrections (DOC) annually distributes base funding of \$3,750,000 to counties for early intervention services for first offenders and for intensive community-based intervention services for seriously chronic offenders. A county receiving Community Intervention funding is required to submit an expenditure plan that ensures that the funds are targeted appropriately. The total funding is allocated as follows: (a) 33% of the funds are distributed based on each county's proportion of the violent Part I juvenile arrests reported statewide, during the most recent two-year period; (b) 33% of the funds are distributed based on each county's proportion of the number of children statewide who are placed in a juvenile correctional institution or a secured child caring institution during the most recent two-year period; and (c) 34% of the funds are distributed based on each county's proportion of the total Part I juvenile arrests reported statewide during the most recent two-year period.

GOVERNOR

Transfer \$3,750,000 GPR annually and the community intervention program from DOC to the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS). Eliminate the requirement that these funds be used for first offenders and for serious chronic offenders (funds would still be required to be used for early intervention and intensive community-based intervention services). Under the bill, the formula for distribution of the funds would not change.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Community intervention program grants are currently provided to 71 counties (Iron County did not apply for funding). This includes three counties (Clark, Iowa and Kewaunee) that did not apply for funding in 1995-96, but are receiving funding in 1996-97. Thirty one counties provide early intervention services for first offenders, seven counties provide intensive community-based intervention services for seriously chronic offenders and 33 counties provide services to both target groups. DOC officials indicate that current community intervention program services are generally popular with judges, law enforcement, school, and other local officials. The Attachment to this paper lists these counties, the grant amounts for 1996-97 and the category of services provided.
2. Early intervention delinquency services may begin when a juvenile is identified as being at risk for delinquency because of certain indicators, including truancy, poor school performance, delinquent older siblings and the commission of petty offenses. Services are typically designed to hold juveniles accountable for their actions and to provide juveniles and their families with increased competencies to prevent more serious behavior, or a repetition of a behavior, from occurring.
3. Intensive community-based intervention delinquency services emphasize community safety by closely monitoring the juvenile's activities, restricting movement to within certain environments and enforcing strict rules of supervision. Electronic monitoring may be a component of intensive intervention services.
4. Generally, community intervention program services are a combination of county-provided services and services provided under contracts with private agencies. For example, in 1995-96, services in Milwaukee were provided by 28 community- and neighborhood-based organizations.
5. The transfer of the community intervention program was not requested by either DOC or DHFS. DOA budget officials indicate that the Governor's recommendation is based on DOA's assessment of current community intervention program grants and a conclusion that the most effective of these programs are prevention oriented. Based on this assessment, it was determined that the grant funds would be more appropriately administered under DHFS as prevention funding for children.
6. DOA officials also indicate that the transfer of the community intervention program and other prevention programs would address certain recommendations made in the Legislative Audit Bureau (LAB) evaluation of state prevention programming. In its September, 1996, report on the state's prevention programs, however, the LAB did not identify the community intervention program as a prevention program and it was not discussed in the report.

7. The LAB report identified certain advantages and disadvantages of consolidating prevention programs. An integrated prevention program could produce a more comprehensive, consistent prevention policy, enhance long-term planning and produce administrative efficiencies. On the other hand, consolidation within a larger agency could result in inadequate attention to issues that may be controversial or exceptionally sensitive. Policies regarding prevention programming could also be affected by changes in the administration of the agency. Finally, most state and local staff interviewed for the report indicated that there was some benefit to maintaining multiple administrative agencies in providing prevention services. Multiple and diverse approaches to prevention may be more likely to result in multiple perspectives that lead to useful discussion and debate on prevention policy.

8. It could be argued that all prevention services should be delivered in an integrated, community-based system, and that DHFS is the appropriate agency to administer such a system. This approach is based on the belief that a variety of factors influence behaviors in children, and that local communities are best able to assess their needs and target prevention funds towards those needs. Because DHFS serves as the lead state agency for providing services to children and families, it can best administer an integrated community-based prevention program.

9. The community intervention program provides flexibility to counties in targeting services to delinquent juveniles. Local officials, particularly in Milwaukee County, have expressed support for the program under current law and no problems relating to the program's administration are apparent. The proposed transfer of the program does not appear aimed at making specific improvements in intervention services for delinquent juveniles, but rather to consolidate certain programs for juveniles, currently operated by several agencies, under DHFS. If the rationale for such consolidation is persuasive, the transfer of the community intervention program may enhance the effort planned under DHFS.

10. Under the bill, the current law requirement that community intervention program funds be used for first offenders and for serious chronic offenders would be eliminated. It could be argued that DHFS, with its child welfare orientation, would eventually shift resources into prevention and early intervention services for children, rather than delinquent juveniles. DOA also indicates that the deletion of the statutory requirement would likely affect the current use of funds, particularly in shifting funding away from a focus on chronic juvenile offenders. If community intervention program funding is reduced for delinquency services, the continuation of these services would require alternative county funding.

11. In order to ensure that the focus of the program remains on delinquency-related intervention, it could be argued that the statutory requirement that community intervention program funding target first-time offenders and serious chronic offenders should be retained. With this modification, the focus on first-time and chronic juvenile offenders could be maintained, with the transfer of the program to DHFS. However, if this delinquency focus is maintained, DOC could be viewed as a more appropriate agency to administer the program, given its responsibilities relating to delinquency issues.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Adopt the Governor's recommendation to transfer \$3,750,000 GPR annually from Corrections to the Department of Health and Family Services to reflect the transfer of the community intervention program. Eliminate the requirement that these funds be used for first offenders (early intervention services) and for serious chronic offenders (intensive community-based intervention services).

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by transferring the community intervention program to the Department of Health and Family Services, but retain the current law requirement that these funds be used for first offenders (early intervention services) and for serious chronic offenders (intensive community-based intervention services).

3. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Art Zimmerman

MO# AH #3

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

ATTACHMENT

Community Intervention Program Grants 1996-97

<u>County</u>	<u>Grant Allocation</u>	<u>Target Group</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Grant Allocation</u>	<u>Target Group</u>
1 Adams	\$4,362	Both groups	36 Manitowoc	\$54,329	Both groups
2 Ashland	6,022	Early intervention	37 Marathon	60,626	Both groups
3 Barron	14,887	Both groups	38 Marinette	14,362	Early intervention
4 Bayfield	4,398	Early intervention	39 Marquette	1,724	Early intervention
5 Brown	110,164	Early intervention	40 Menominee	12,431	Both groups
6 Buffalo	2,816	Early intervention	41 Milwaukee	1,532,150	Early intervention
7 Burnett	6,162	Early intervention	42 Monroe	16,652	Both groups
8 Calumet	8,339	Early intervention	43 Oconto	5,061	Early intervention
9 Chippewa	16,033	Both groups	44 Oneida	26,028	Both groups
10 Clark	6,023	Early intervention	45 Outagamie	82,001	Serious/chronic
11 Columbia	13,592	Early intervention	46 Ozaukee	16,129	Serious/chronic
12 Crawford	4,645	Early intervention	47 Pepin	3,195	Early intervention
13 Dane	248,801	Both groups	48 Pierce	4,989	Early intervention
14 Dodge	33,778	Early intervention	49 Polk	16,023	Serious/chronic
15 Door	6,345	Early intervention	50 Portage	26,316	Serious/chronic
16 Douglas	30,939	Early intervention	51 Price	4,590	Both groups
17 Dunn	9,577	Both groups	52 Racine	259,935	Both groups
18 Eau Claire	49,010	Both groups	53 Richland	4,212	Both groups
19 Florence	2,315	Both groups	54 Rock	130,112	Both groups
20 Fond du Lac	85,015	Serious/chronic	55 Rusk	11,047	Both groups
21 Forest	14,582	Early intervention	56 St. Croix	8,815	Both groups
22 Grant	7,658	Both groups	57 Sauk	19,906	Early intervention
23 Green	7,862	Both groups	58 Sawyer	10,806	Both groups
24 Green Lake	6,153	Early intervention	59 Shawano	21,867	Early intervention
25 Iowa	4,122	Early intervention	60 Sheboygan	65,994	Both groups
26 Iron	0	Did not apply	61 Taylor	3,294	Early intervention
27 Jackson	3,862	Early intervention	62 Trempealeau	1,683	Early intervention
28 Jefferson	37,688	Both groups	63 Vernon	4,829	Both groups
29 Juneau	6,905	Early intervention	64 Vilas	13,213	Early intervention
30 Kenosha	118,304	Both groups	65 Walworth	31,362	Both groups
31 Kewaunee	2,769	Serious/chronic	66 Washburn	2,887	Early intervention
32 LaCrosse	51,190	Both groups	67 Washington	48,050	Serious/chronic
33 Lafayette	1,769	Early intervention	68 Waukesha	121,832	Both groups
34 Langlade	13,190	Early intervention	69 Waupaca	26,740	Both groups
35 Lincoln	22,336	Both groups	70 Waushara	4,628	Both groups
			71 Winnebago	78,956	Both groups
			72 Wood	41,613	Both groups
			Total	\$3,750,000	

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Block Grants (DHFS -- Children and Family Services and Supportive Living)

[LFB Summary: Page 319, #17]

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) receives federal funds under the substance abuse prevention and treatment (SAPT) block grant for programs that prevent and treat substance abuse. In 1996-97, DHFS received a total of \$23,380,900 FED from the SAPT block grant. DHFS also receives federal funds under the community mental health (CMH) block grant for programs to provide comprehensive community mental health services to adults with serious mental illness and children with a serious emotional disturbance. In 1996-97, DHFS received \$5,148,400 FED from the CMH block grant.

SAPT Block Grant. In 1996-97, \$11,285,200 from the SAPT block grant is distributed to counties as a categorical allocation in community aids. This amount represented approximately 47% of the total SAPT block grant award. Counties must meet federal requirements relating to the use of these funds. The remaining SAPT funds are budgeted to support: (a) substance abuse treatment programs at correctional facilities (\$1,349,200); (b) local programs for substance abuse treatment and prevention (\$9,560,200); and (c) state operational costs of administering substance abuse programs (\$1,186,300).

The statutes require DHFS to distribute funding from the SAPT block grant for specific programs. These allocations include: (a) \$900,000 for a multidisciplinary prevention and treatment program for cocaine-abusing women and their children in Milwaukee County; (b) \$35,000 for services to women and children in Dane County provided by the ARC Community

Services Center; and (c) \$300,000 for a youth gang diversion program administered by the Department of Corrections.

Further, within the limits of available federal funds, DHFS is required to distribute \$1,200,000 for neighborhood drug use and violence prevention projects. Funds can be used to support the creation of Wisconsin against drug environments (WADE) centers, culturally representative alcohol and other drug abuse trainers, community speakers and persons to monitor certain court actions. DHFS may distribute these grants to: (a) cities, villages or towns; (b) a community-based organization in the City of Milwaukee that represents city-wide interests, has a membership that represents diverse neighborhood interests and organizations and has a board of directors that is elected by its membership; and (c) county human services departments and county departments of community programs.

CMH Block Grant. In 1996-97, \$2,513,400 from the CMH block grant is distributed to counties as a categorical allocation under community aids, an amount that represents 49% of the total CMH block grant allocation. Counties are required to comply with all federal requirements regarding the use of these funds. In 1996-97, the CMH block grant is also used to fund: (a) local programs for mental health services (\$1,087,000); (b) integrated services programs for children with severe emotional disturbances (\$1,330,500); and (c) state operational costs of administering mental health service programs (\$217,500).

By statute, DHFS is required to distribute annually from the CMH block grant: (a) \$240,000 for mental health programs for children with severe emotional disturbances; (b) \$350,000 for system change grants to assist in relocating individuals with mental illness from institutional or residential care to the community by providing community-based services; (c) \$182,000 for training for mental health professionals; (d) \$180,000 for services to consumers of mental health services and their families; and (e) \$75,000 for community mental health protection and advocacy.

GOVERNOR

Authorize DHFS to distribute up to the current statutory allocation amounts for the following programs: (a) multidisciplinary prevention and treatment program for cocaine-abusing women and their children in Milwaukee County (\$900,000); (b) services to women and children in Dane County provided by the ARC community services center (\$35,000); (c) the youth gang diversion program administered by the Department of Corrections (\$300,000); (d) neighborhood drug use and violence prevention programs (\$1,200,000); (e) mental health programs for children with severe emotional disturbances (\$240,000); (f) system change grants to assist in relocating individuals with mental illness from institutional or residential care to the community by providing community-based services (\$350,000); (g) training for mental health professionals (\$182,000); (h) services to consumers of mental health services and their families (\$180,000); and (i) community mental health protection and advocacy (\$75,000). DHFS would no longer be

required to allocate specific funding amounts for these programs but rather, would be prohibited from expending more than the statutory allocation amounts.

Further, provide that community-based nonprofit organizations are also eligible to receive grants for the neighborhood drug use and violence prevention program.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Statutory Allocations

1. Based on recent federal reductions in SAPT and CMH block grant awards, the total amount of funding provided in SB 77 to fund current programs supported by these block grants has been reduced. The following table identifies actual block grant allocations for 1996-97 and total allocations in SB 77 for 1997-98 and 1998-99.

**Total Estimated SAPT and CMH Block Grant Allocations
Actual Fiscal Year 1996-97 and Amounts Budgeted in SB 77**

	<u>1996-97</u>	<u>1997-98</u>	<u>1998-99</u>
SAPT Block Grant	\$23,380,900	\$21,655,300	\$21,140,900
CMH Block Grant	5,148,400	5,001,800	5,001,800

2. The SB 77 provisions would provide DHFS the flexibility to reduce funding for certain programs, based on the availability of federal funding. Under current law, DHFS must allocate specific amounts of funding for each program, regardless of the availability of federal funds. However, under SB 77, if federal funding exceeds current projections, DHFS could allocate funding up to the amounts specified in statute.

Current requirements for funding from the CMH block grant for mental health programs for children with severe emotional disturbances and consumer support grants represent funding increases provided for these programs in 1995 Wisconsin Act 27, rather than total funding that would have been required under Act 27. These statutory requirements should reflect current allocations for these programs (\$1,330,500 annually for mental health programs for children with severe emotional disturbances and \$480,000 annually for consumer support grants) rather than increased funding provided in Act 27.

3. DHFS intends to allocate amounts less than the statutory allocations for most of these programs to reflect projected reductions in federal funding. The table below identifies actual funding distributed for specific programs in 1996-97 and the amounts DHFS intends to budget for these programs in the 1997-99 biennium.

<u>Program</u>	<u>1996-97</u>	<u>1997-98</u>	<u>1998-99</u>
SAPT Block Grant			
Neighborhood drug use and violence prevention	\$1,200,000	\$1,112,300	\$1,083,600
Cocaine-abusing women	900,000	900,000	900,000
ARC community services	235,000	217,800	212,200
Youth gang diversion	300,000	278,100	270,900
CMH Block Grant			
Mental health programs for children with SED	\$1,330,500	\$1,330,500	\$1,330,500
System change grants	350,000	304,500	304,500
Professional training	182,000	158,000	158,000
Consumer support grants	480,000	417,500	417,500
Protection and advocacy	75,000	65,000	65,000

3. The DHFS allocation plan would proportionately reduce amounts allocated for seven of these nine programs. Funding for the cocaine-abusing women program and mental health services for children with severe emotional disturbances would be maintained at the 1996-97 level. DHFS staff indicate that maintaining funding for these programs is a high priority due to populations served under these two programs. Without the flexibility to reduce federal funding for programs, DHFS will be limited in its ability to proportionately distribute any federal funding reductions in the future.

4. SB 77 reduces funding for state operations supported by these block grants by approximately 18.5% in 1997-98 and 23.6% in 1998-99. These reductions are greater than those proposed for the programs with statutory allocations (-7.3% in 1997-98 and -10.7% in 1998-99 for SAPT block grant-supported programs and -13.2% in 1997-98 and -15.1% in 1998-99 for CMH block grant-supported programs).

5. The Committee could modify the statutory allocations for these programs so that they are consistent with the amounts budgeted for these programs in SB 77. This would be consistent with the current practice of specifying the funding amounts to be provided for these programs in statute. However, if federal funds for these block grants are adjusted in the future, DHFS would not be provided the flexibility to adjust funding amounts for these programs based on future federal funding adjustments.

To address the issue of flexibility, the Committee could both: (a) adjust the statutory allocations to reflect amounts budgeted in SB 77 for these programs; and (b) authorize DHFS to allocate up to the amounts specified in statute.

WADE Program

6. SB 77 would provide that nonprofit, community-based organizations are eligible for grants under the neighborhood drug and violence prevention program (the WADE program). Currently, local units of government and, only in Milwaukee County, a community-based organization are eligible to receive funding.

7. DHFS has recently made administrative changes to the WADE program to address broad economic issues and expand the focus of the program from a neighborhood-based program to a county-wide program. The request-for-proposal (RFP) for contracts in Milwaukee County beginning July 1, 1997, indicates the following changes would be made to the program:

- Projects funded would be administered county-wide, rather than city-wide to enhance coordination with other county-wide efforts, utilize resources that may be available to the county as well as the city, and conform with funding and service boundaries as established by the Wisconsin Works initiative.

- Increased funds would be targeted to those areas or neighborhoods with the highest need for substance abuse and violence prevention activities.

- Emphasis would be placed on coordination with other appropriate agencies to provide links to related goals of employment, economic development, resident home ownership, youth resiliency efforts and family preservation and support efforts.

8. In a March 31, 1977, letter to legislators, DHFS Secretary Leraan indicated that the program places no less emphasis on direct activities to prevent or limit substance abuse and violence. Further, the recent program changes are based on the belief that employment and community revitalization are necessary to sustain permanent change to create a climate for decreasing substance abuse and violence and that coordination with other appropriate agencies related to goals of employment, economic development, and resident home ownership are related to the goals of reducing drug use and violence. The Secretary's letter indicates that DHFS is addressing issues raised in a Legislative Audit Bureau report on prevention programs indicating that a number of societal influences affect substance abuse and violence.

9. It could be argued that the Department's recent expansion of the scope of the program exceeds the intent of current law. SB 77 provides no statutory changes to the program other than expansion of organizations eligible to receive funds. If the Committee supports the recent changes DHFS has made to the program, it could amend the current statutes to specify that organizations receiving funds shall establish links to other community organizations that address issues of employment, economic development and resident home ownership as a means of preventing drug use and violence. Alternatively, the Committee could prohibit the use of funds under the neighborhood drug use and violence prevention projects for activities related to employment, economic development and home ownership, in order to retain the focus of the program on drug use and violence.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

A. Allocations from the SAPT and CMH Block Grants

1. ^{Miss} Modify the Governor's recommendations to reflect current allocations for mental health programs for children with severe emotional disturbances (\$1,330,500) and consumer support grants (\$480,000).

2. Delete the Governor's recommendations. Instead, require that DHFS distribute the following amounts from the SAPT block grant in the 1997-99 biennium: (a) \$1,112,300 in 1997-98 and \$1,083,600 in 1998-99 for neighborhood drug use and violence prevention; (b) \$900,000 annually for cocaine-abusing women and their children; (c) \$217,800 in 1997-98 and \$212,200 in 1998-99 for ARC community services to provide services to women and children; and (d) \$278,100 in 1997-98 and \$270,900 in 1998-99 for youth gang diversion. From the appropriation for the federal CMH block grant, the following will be distributed: (a) \$1,330,500 annually for mental health programs for children with severe emotional disturbances; (b) \$304,500 annually for system change grants to assist in relocating individuals with mental illness from institutional or residential care to the community by providing community-based services; (c) \$158,000 annually for training for mental health professionals; (d) \$417,500 annually for services to consumers of mental health services; and (e) \$65,000 annually for community mental health protection and advocacy.

3. Adopt the statutory allocations identified under Alternative (2). In addition, authorize DHFS to allocate funding up to the statutory amounts.

B. Neighborhood Drug Use and Violence Prevention Projects

1. ^{FAIL} Modify provisions relating to the neighborhood drug use and violence prevention projects by requiring that organizations that receive funds establish links to other community organizations that address issues of employment, economic development and resident home ownership as a means of preventing drug use and violence.

2. ^{FAIL} Modify current statutory provisions relating to the neighborhood drug use and violence prevention projects by prohibiting the use of funds for neighborhood drug use and violence prevention for activities related to employment, economic development and home ownership.

Prepared by: Rachel Cissne

MO# Alt # 1

JENSEN	X	N	A
OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	X	N	A

BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	X	N	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 10 NO 0 ABS 0

PAPER #474

MO# A17 #31

JENSEN	X	N	A
OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

MO# A17 #32

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	X	N	A

1 BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	X	N	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
2 WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

To: Joint Committee on Finance
From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Drug Abuse Program Improvement Surcharge and the Alliance for a Drug-Free Wisconsin (DHFS -- Children and Family Services and Supportive Living)

[LFB Summary: Page 325, #28 and #29]

CURRENT LAW

Drug Abuse Program Improvement Surcharge (DAPIS). Under the state's uniform controlled substances act, courts are required to impose a surcharge of 50% on applicable fines and penalty assessments charged for persons convicted of certain controlled substances-related offenses. All moneys collected from the surcharge are credited to a DHFS appropriation to support programs for prevention, intervention and treatment for alcohol and other drug abuse problems.

For 1996-97, DHFS has budgeted \$758,800 PR of DAPIS funds for: (a) training of local substance abuse treatment staff (\$25,000); (b) a treatment program for hearing impaired persons (\$125,000); (c) a training coordinator position to promote staff development for substance abuse counselors statewide (\$66,100); (d) a development specialist position to provide technical assistance, consultation and training to substance abuse program providers (\$54,200); (e) funding for positions and grants for the Alliance for a Drug-Free Wisconsin (\$238,500); and (f) programs that are also supported by the federal substance abuse prevention and treatment (SAPT) block grant (\$250,000).

Alliance for a Drug-Free Wisconsin Grants. DHFS allocates funds to local organizations that promote a grassroots ethic against drugs and alcohol and community-based prevention efforts. There are 132 of these organizations, commonly referred to as alliances for a drug-free Wisconsin, that are eligible to receive these funds. Currently, 1.50 positions in DHFS provide state level leadership for local alliances by promoting and developing collaboration and coordination among state agencies and local alliances and managing the implementation of the

state plan for expanding local alliances. Staff costs total \$138,500 PR in 1996-97. In addition, \$100,000 PR is budgeted in 1996-97 to promote substance abuse prevention activities and provide grants.

Research Evaluation Funding. In 1996-97, DHFS is budgeted \$23,500 GPR to collect data on the effectiveness of substance abuse and outcomes of treatment programs. Three hospitals received a total of \$6,000 to collect data on substance abuse-related emergency room visits. In addition, \$17,000 was provided as start-up grants to treatment providers for data collection activities and \$500 was used for data reports from the Division of Health on substance abuse related morality rates and other data. The data collected is used to provide information in the biennial Wisconsin Alcohol and Drug Abuse Indicators report produced by DHFS.

GOVERNOR

Alliance for a Drug-Free Wisconsin Grants. Provide \$50,000 PR annually to increase funding for grants to local alliance for a drug-free Wisconsin from \$100,000 PR to \$150,000 PR, beginning in 1997-98. Provide \$50,000 PR annually to reflect the transfer of DAPIS funds from the Division of Supportive Living (DSL) to the Division of Children and Family Services (DCFS), which is responsible for administering these grants.

GPR Funding Reductions. Reduce funding for alcohol and other drug abuse research evaluation conducted by BSAS by \$23,500 GPR annually and convert 1.0 GPR position in BSAS to PR supported by DAPIS revenues, beginning in 1997-98. Reduce funding by \$71,200 GPR annually and provide a corresponding PR increase to reflect the conversion of this position.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The following table identifies the projected DAPIS opening balance, revenues and expenditures and closing balance for 1995-96 through 1998-99, as provided in SB 77.

DAPIS Revenues and Expenditures Fiscal Years 1995-96 Through 1998-99 Senate Bill 77

	Actual			
	<u>1995-96*</u>	<u>1996-97**</u>	<u>1997-98</u>	<u>1998-99</u>
Opening Balance	\$583,400	\$383,800	\$296,400	\$352,500
Revenue	648,900	671,400	694,600	718,600
Expenditures	<u>848,500</u>	<u>758,800</u>	<u>638,500</u>	<u>649,000</u>
Closing Balance	\$383,800	\$296,400	\$352,500	\$422,100

*Expenditures include \$400,000 transferred to community aids.

**Expenditures include \$250,000 transferred to fund programs supported by the substance abuse prevention and treatment block grant.

The table shows that, even with the Governor's recommendation to increase funding for programs supported by DAPIS funds and to convert 1.0 current GPR position to PR, \$422,100 is projected to be available from these revenues at the end of the 1997-99 biennium.

Alliance for a Drug-Free Wisconsin

2. Local alliances use DAPIS funds to conduct public awareness activities. A 1992 evaluation of these programs conducted by DHFS indicated that local alliances engage in a wide variety of activities, including: (a) support for a red ribbon campaign (red ribbons signify support for an alcohol and drug-free lifestyle), (b) latchkey programs, where children whose parents work can participate in structured recreational activities; (c) chemical-free events, such as parties and dances where alcohol and drugs are not permitted; and (d) "choices and challenges," a drug and alcohol prevention program that covers topics such as drug awareness, warning signs and parenting techniques. Alliances often sponsor conferences, guest speakers, the development and distribution of newsletters and reference guides and media campaigns.

3. The DHFS evaluation concluded that many of these programs had successful outcomes, as measured by the number of persons attending events or exposure to media campaigns. However, because these programs were relatively new, the evaluation presented no conclusive evidence on the long-term effects of these programs, as measured by reductions in drug-related arrests or convictions or changed attitudes among participants.

4. Although the number of local alliances for a drug-free Wisconsin has increased significantly since they were established in 1989, funding for grants has not increased since that time. As of February, 1997, there are 132 local alliances, compared with 20 local alliances in 1989. In fiscal year 1996-97, 64 local alliances requested grants totalling \$136,000, however, only \$44,000 was distributed. The remainder of the \$100,000 is budgeted for other costs to support local alliances.

As an alternative to the Governor's recommendation, the Committee could increase funding for grants by an amount that represents the difference between the amount requested (\$136,000) in SB 77 and provided in 1996-97 (\$44,000). However, establishing a funding level for the program that reflects total requested funds may result in: (a) the substitution of state funds for funds that would otherwise be raised by local alliances; and (b) state support for lower-priority projects.

GPR Funding Reductions

5. SB 77 would reduce DHFS funding by \$23,500 GPR annually to eliminate base funding for research evaluation activities. This funding is used to collect information for the Wisconsin Alcohol and Drug Abuse Indicators report produced by DHFS. DHFS would continue to be required to produce the report, but some demographic data specific to Wisconsin would not be available and some outcome information would not be available in the report. However, DHFS would continue to receive information on local activities related to substance abuse

through other sources. The report is used by the Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse and members of the public.

6. SB 77 would convert 1.0 GPR position in the Bureau of Substance Abuse Services (BSAS) to 1.0 PR position, and reduce GPR funding by \$71,200 and increase PR funding by a corresponding amount in each year to reflect the conversion. This position is a supervisory position responsible for coordinating and implementing specialized substance abuse program operations and policy directions, planning, directing and coordinating the activities and programmatic objectives of the program planning, monitoring and evaluation unit of BSAS and serves as the single point of contact for county community service boards and human services departments for technical assistance and consultation requests.

7. DHFS identified the provisions to eliminate \$23,500 GPR annually for research evaluation activities and convert 1.0 GPR position to a 1.0 PR position in response to a Department of Administration requirement that state agencies submit options for budget efficiency measures.

If the Committee wished to use DAPIS funds to support costs that are currently supported by GPR, as provided in SB 77 with respect to the 1.0 GPR position in BSAS, it could increase community aids funds by \$250,000 PR on a one-time basis in 1997-98 and reduce funding by a corresponding amount of GPR. In 1995-96, DOA transferred \$400,000 PR of DAPIS funds on a one-time basis to community aids. Alternatively, these revenues could be used to increase community aids on a one-time basis. Because these changes would be made in 1997-98, DAPIS revenues would not be included in the 1998-99 community aids base.

Vacant BSAS Positions

8. DHFS is budgeted \$233,900 FED and 8.0 FED positions annually to provide case management services to individuals receiving supplemental security income (SSI) benefits for a disability due to alcoholism or drug addiction. Federal law changes have eliminated eligibility for SSI on the basis of alcoholism or drug addiction and no longer provide funding for case management staff. These positions have been vacant since 1996. This funding and position authority should be eliminated.

Legislative Oversight of DAPIS Revenue

9. Under current law, DHFS is authorized to expend all moneys it receives from the State Treasurer from DAPIS revenues. While this provision maximizes administrative flexibility for DHFS, as a practical matter, it provides the Legislature with little role in budgeting DAPIS funds. For example, under current law, DHFS could increase funds for grants to local alliances for a drug-free Wisconsin without legislative approval if revenues are sufficient to support increased program costs. If the Committee wished to limit DAPIS expenditures to the amounts budgeted by the Legislature and for the purposes authorized by the Legislature, it could modify the appropriation to limit DHFS expenditures from the PR appropriation to the amounts budgeted

in the appropriation schedule. If additional amounts were forthcoming, the Department could submit a s. 16.505/515 request to the Committee.

10. However, such a change would limit the administration's flexibility to transfer funding to support other programs. In 1996-97 for example, DOA increased DHFS expenditure authority for DAPIS revenues in order to help offset reductions in the SAPT block grant.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

A. Alliance for a Drug-Free Wisconsin

see Motion #3124

1. Adopt the Governor's recommendations to increase funding for grants distributed by the Alliance for a Drug-Free Wisconsin by \$50,000 PR annually and increase funding by a corresponding amount to reflect the transfer of these funds from the Division of Supportive Living to the Division of Children and Family Services.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendations by increasing funding by \$42,000 PR annually and increasing funding by a corresponding amount to reflect the transfer of these funds from the Division of Supportive Living to the Division of Children and Family Services.

<u>Alternative A2</u>	<u>PR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$168,000

3. Delete the Governor's recommendation to provide increased funding for grants.

<u>Alternative A3</u>	<u>PR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$200,000

B. GPR Funding Reductions

1. Adopt the Governor's recommendation to convert 1.0 GPR position in BSAS to PR, beginning in 1997-98, and reduce funding by \$71,200 GPR annually and increase PR funding by a corresponding amount and delete \$23,500 GPR annually for research evaluation activities.

2. Delete provision.

<u>Alternative B2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$189,400	- \$142,400	\$47,000

C. Alternative Uses of the DAPIS Balance

1. Increase community aids funding by \$250,000 PR in 1997-98.

<u>Alternative C1</u>	<u>PR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$250,000

2. Increase community aids funding by \$250,000 PR in 1997-98 and reduce GPR funding by a corresponding amount.

<u>Alternative C2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	-\$250,000	\$250,000	\$0

3. Take no action.

D. Vacant BSAS Positions

1. Delete \$233,900 FED annually and 8.0 FED vacant positions, beginning in 1997-98, to reflect the termination of federal funding for case management services to individuals who receive SSI benefits for a disability due to alcoholism or drug addiction.

<u>Modification</u>	<u>FED</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	-\$467,800
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	- 8.00

E. Modify Appropriation

1. Limit DHFS expenditures of DAPIS funds to the amounts budgeted by the Legislature.

2. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Rachel Cissne

MO# AH #02

2 JENSEN	X	N	A
1 OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	Y	X	A

BURKE	Y	X	A
DECKER	Y	X	A
GEORGE	Y	X	A
JAUCH	Y	X	A
WINEKE	Y	X	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	X	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 9 NO 7 ABS _____

PAPER #475

MO# AH #1/1 #1

ZJENSEN	X	N	A
OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	X	N	A

/ BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	X	N	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES

Local Alliances for a Drug-Free Wisconsin

Motion:

Move to modify Alternative #1 of Paper #475, to require DHFS to allocate at least 75% of the \$150,000 PR annually provided under this Alternative (including \$100,000 PR in base funding) for grants to local alliances for a drug-free Wisconsin.

Note:

This motion would specify that 75% of the \$150,000 PR annually available for grants and technical assistance would be provided as grants to local alliances. In 1996-97, 44% of \$100,000 PR available for grants and technical assistance was distributed as grants to local alliances.

MO# 3124

JENSEN	X	N	A
OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	X	N	A
1 BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	X	N	A
2 JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS _____

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE**Intoxicated Driver Program (DHFS -- Children and Family Services and Supportive Living)**

[LFB Summary: Page 325, #30]

CURRENT LAW

Persons convicted of operating while intoxicated (OWI) offenses are required to pay a \$300 driver improvement surcharge in addition to any applicable fine, forfeiture, penalty assessment and jail assessment. County clerks collect and transmit revenue from the driver improvement surcharge to the county treasurer, except that if the forfeiture is imposed by a municipal court, the court transmits revenue from the driver improvement surcharge to the treasurer of the county, city, town or village. In either case, local treasurers are required to submit 29.2% of the amount collected to the state treasurer. The balance (70.8%) is retained or transmitted to the county and used to fund treatment services for persons convicted of OWI offenses. Treatment may include traffic safety schools, outpatient alcohol or other substance abuse treatment, detoxification and inpatient treatment.

Funding forwarded to the state from the OWI surcharge is initially credited to two appropriations to the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS). First, 14.2% of the total amount of OWI surcharge revenue is credited to an appropriation that DHFS uses to distribute funds to counties that otherwise have costs in excess of revenues for the treatment of drivers referred through assessment. In 1996-97, DHFS is authorized to expend up to \$1,000,000 PR to supplement county funds retained for these services.

Second, 15% is credited to an appropriation that enables the Secretary of DOA, after consulting with the Secretaries of DHFS, DOT, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Attorney General and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, to transfer these funds

to four appropriations in four different agencies. These appropriations include: (a) a DHFS appropriation that funds unanticipated deficits in poor, rural counties' intoxicated driver programs; (b) a Department of Justice appropriation to support crime victim compensation services; (c) a University of Wisconsin System appropriation that funds State Laboratory of Hygiene costs associated with services for drivers; and (d) a DPI appropriation that supports services for drivers. On June 30 of each year, the unencumbered balance of three of these four appropriations reverts to the DHFS appropriation from which these moneys are initially budgeted. (Funds transferred to the State Laboratory of Hygiene do not revert to the DHFS appropriation at the end of each fiscal year.)

In the 1996-97 fiscal year, DHFS is budgeted a total of \$1,150,000 PR in two different appropriations to distribute to counties to support services for drivers, including \$1,000,000 PR to provide funds to counties that otherwise have costs in excess of revenues and \$150,000 PR to support unanticipated deficits in poor, rural counties intoxicated driver programs.

GOVERNOR

Repeal the current DHFS appropriation to which 14.2% of revenues generated by the OWI surcharge is credited, and transfer base funding from the repealed appropriation (\$1,000,000 PR annually) to the remaining appropriation. Under the bill, DHFS would be authorized to allocate to counties \$1,150,000 PR annually for services to drivers referred through assessment, based on a plan developed by DHFS. In addition, specify that all of the OWI surcharge revenues received by the State Treasurer would be initially credited to the DHFS appropriation from which the DOA Secretary is authorized to make transfers.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. On May 22, 1997, the Committee took two actions relating to the OWI surcharge based on information presented in LFB Papers #881 and #882.

Purchase of Breath Testing Equipment. First, the Committee authorized the DOA Secretary to transfer amounts from the DHFS appropriation in 1997-98, as deemed necessary to fund the cost of breath testing instruments to a new, PR continuing appropriation in the Department of Transportation for the purchase and maintenance of these instruments. At the time the paper was prepared, it was estimated that the projected unencumbered balance of the DHFS appropriation would be \$2.1 million at the end of the 1996-97 fiscal year, an amount sufficient to support the estimated cost of purchasing all of the machines at one time (\$1,990,400). The Governor had recommended that the OWI surcharge be increased from \$300 to \$315, and that the additional revenue generated by the increase in the surcharge be used to support the purchase of this equipment on a five-year financing agreement totalling \$2,345,500.

Support for Chemical Test Section. Second, the Committee increased the OWI surcharge from \$300 to \$340, applicable to offenses that occur on or after the bill's general effective date, to transfer the support of the chemical test section within the Division of State Patrol from SEG (transportation fund) to PR (OWI surcharge revenues). The projected increase in revenue (\$466,700 in 1997-98 and \$933,300 in 1998-99) would be used to support a new, PR appropriation for DOT, with \$444,200 PR in 1997-98 and \$888,300 PR in 1998-99. To ensure that the total amount of additional revenue resulting from the OWI surcharge was forwarded to the state to support these costs, the proposal increased the percentage of total OWI surcharge revenue distributed to the state from 29.2% to 37.6%.

2. Under SB 77, the total amount of funding that would be budgeted to supplement funding to counties that otherwise have costs in excess of revenues for treatment of drivers referred through assessment (\$1,150,000 PR annually) significantly exceeds the total payments to counties from this appropriation in the 1995-97 biennium. This suggests that total funding for supplemental funds could be reduced to more closely reflect the historical demand for these funds. Further, there appears to be no reason to continue to earmark funds to support unanticipated deficits for poor rural counties.

- In 1995-96, DHFS distributed a total of \$119,206 in supplemental funds to five counties and one combination of counties (Ashland, Barron, Clark, Dunn, Forest/Vilas, Langlade and Menominee); no payments were made from the appropriation used to fund unanticipated deficits for poor, rural counties.

- In 1996-97, county requests for funds totaled \$183,286, including: (a) \$175,085 of supplemental funds; and (b) \$8,201 to support unanticipated deficits for poor, rural counties. Actual 1996-97 claims were \$424,200 less than projected at the time the Committee took action on funding for the breath testing instruments and chemical test program.

3. Table 1 on the Attachment shows that, based on the Committee's action to date, the projected balance of the OWI surcharge revenue appropriation would be \$640,900 PR at the end of the 1997-99 biennium. However, if the Committee elected to reduce funding for supplemental payments to counties to more closely reflect demand for these supplemental funds, the Committee would have several options to consider. For example, as Table 2 on the attachment shows, if funding for supplemental payments to counties were reduced from \$1,150,000 PR to \$500,000, an amount the administration indicates would be sufficient to support supplements in the 1997-99 biennium, the projected balance of the OWI surcharge appropriation would be approximately \$1.9 million.

4. The Committee could transfer a portion of base funding currently allocated for county supplemental funds to community aids. In order to maintain a comparable balance in the OWI surcharge appropriation based on the Committee's previous action on this issue, \$650,000 PR annually could be transferred to increase community aids funding in both 1997-98 and 1998-99. Table 3 of the Attachment shows the projected balance of the OWI surcharge appropriation

under this alternative. Further, if the Committee transfers these funds to community aids, it could also reduce GPR support for community aids by a corresponding amount and maintain total funding for community aids at the level recommended by the Governor in SB 77.

5. Finally, the Committee could reduce funding for county supplemental payments and delete the increase in the OWI surcharge the Committee recommended as a means of supporting the chemical test section in DOT. Under this alternative, the projected 1997-99 closing balance for the OWI surcharge appropriation would be \$540,900, as shown on Table 4 of the Attachment. However, budgeted expenditures in 1998-99 would exceed projected revenues in that year by approximately \$250,000, which would create a structural deficit for the appropriation that would need to be addressed in the 1999-2001 budget.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

A. Level of County Supplemental Funds

1. Adopt the Governor's recommendations relating to the consolidation of supplemental funding for counties to a single appropriation and to provide \$1,150,000 PR annually for DHFS to make these payments.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendations by reducing funding for supplemental funds by \$650,000 PR annually.

Alternative A2	PR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$1,300,000

3. Modify the Governor's recommendations by reducing funding for supplemental funds by \$650,000 PR annually. In addition, increase PR funding for community aids by a corresponding amount.

4. ^{FULL} Modify the Governor's recommendations by reducing funding for supplemental funds by \$650,000 PR annually. In addition, increase PR funding for community aids by a corresponding amount and reduce GPR funding for community aids by a corresponding amount.

Alternative A4	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$1,300,000

5. Modify the Governor's recommendations by reducing funding for supplemental funds by \$650,000 PR annually. In addition, maintain the OWI surcharge at \$300, rather than increasing the surcharge to \$340.

Alternative A5	PR
1997-99 REVENUE (Change to Bill)	- \$1,332,500
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$1,300,000

B. Specific Allocation for Poor, Rural Counties

1. Continue to earmark \$150,000 of county supplemental funds to support unforeseen deficits for poor, rural counties. In addition, modify the appropriation to provide a statutory earmark for these funds.

2. ^{PASS} Delete the requirement that DHFS set aside \$150,000 of funding provided for county supplemental funds to support unforeseen deficits of poor, rural counties.

Prepared by: Charles Morgan

MO# AH #4

2 JENSEN	X	N	A
1 OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	X	A
BURKE	Y	X	A
DECKER	Y	X	A
GEORGE	Y	X	A
JAUCH	Y	X	A
WINEKE	Y	X	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	X	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS

MO# AH #3

JENSEN	X	N	A
2 OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	X	N	A
1 BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	X	N	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

MO# AH #B2

1 JENSEN	X	N	A
OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
2 GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	X	N	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS

ATTACHMENT

TABLE 1

SB 77 as Modified by the Committee's Prior Action

	<u>1996-97</u>	<u>1997-98</u>	<u>1998-99</u>
Opening Balance	\$2,646,600	\$2,578,200	\$606,100
Revenues			
Base Estimate	\$1,833,900	\$2,044,000	\$2,044,000
Increase Surcharge to \$340	0	466,700	933,300
Subtotal	<u>\$1,833,900</u>	<u>\$2,510,700</u>	<u>\$2,977,300</u>
Total Available	\$4,480,500	\$5,088,900	\$3,583,400
Expenditures			
DHFS -- Supplemental Funds	\$175,100	\$1,150,000	\$1,150,000
DHFS -- Emergency Funds	8,200	0	0
DOJ*	72,800	39,300	39,300
DPI*	450,400	225,200	225,200
DOT--Breath Testing Equipment	0	1,990,400	0
DOT --Chemical Test Section	0	444,200	888,300
UW*	<u>1,195,800</u>	<u>633,700</u>	<u>639,700</u>
Subtotal	<u>\$1,902,300</u>	<u>\$4,482,800</u>	<u>\$2,942,500</u>
Projected Closing Balance	\$2,578,200	\$606,100	\$640,900

TABLE 2

Alternative A2 -- Reduce Funding for County Supplemental Payments

	<u>1996-97</u>	<u>1997-98</u>	<u>1998-99</u>
Opening Balance	\$2,646,600	\$2,578,200	\$1,256,100
Revenues			
Base Estimate	\$1,833,900	\$2,044,000	\$2,044,000
Increase Surcharge to \$340	0	466,700	933,300
Subtotal	<u>\$1,833,900</u>	<u>\$2,488,200</u>	<u>\$2,932,300</u>
Total Available	\$4,480,500	\$5,088,900	\$4,233,400
Expenditures			
DHFS -- Supplemental Funds	\$175,100	\$500,000	\$500,000
DHFS -- Emergency Funds	8,200	0	0
DOJ*	72,800	39,300	39,300
DPI*	450,400	225,200	225,200
DOT--Breath Testing Equipment	0	1,990,400	0
DOT --Chemical Test Section	0	444,200	888,300
UW*	<u>1,195,800</u>	<u>633,700</u>	<u>639,700</u>
Subtotal	<u>\$1,902,300</u>	<u>\$3,832,800</u>	<u>\$2,292,500</u>
Projected Closing Balance	\$2,578,200	\$1,256,100	\$1,940,900

* Expenses incurred in 1995-96 and 1996-97 were paid from the 1996-97 appropriation.

TABLE 3

**Alternative A3 and A4
Transfer Funding for Supplemental Payments to Community Aids**

	<u>1996-97</u>	<u>1997-98</u>	<u>1998-99</u>
Opening Balance	\$2,646,600	\$2,578,200	\$606,100
Revenues			
Base Estimate	\$1,833,900	\$2,044,000	\$2,044,000
Increase Surcharge to \$340	0	466,700	933,300
Subtotal	<u>\$1,833,900</u>	<u>\$2,510,700</u>	<u>\$2,977,300</u>
Total Available	\$4,480,500	\$5,088,900	\$3,583,400
Expenditures			
DHFS -- Supplemental Funds	\$175,100	\$500,000	\$500,000
DHFS -- Emergency Funds	8,200	0	0
DHFS -- Community Aids	0	650,000	650,000
DOJ*	72,800	39,300	39,300
DPI*	450,400	225,200	225,200
DOT--Breath Testing Equipment	0	1,990,400	0
DOT --Chemical Test Section	0	444,200	888,300
UW*	1,195,800	633,700	639,700
Subtotal	<u>\$1,902,300</u>	<u>\$4,482,800</u>	<u>\$2,942,500</u>
Projected Closing Balance	\$2,578,200	\$606,100	\$640,900

TABLE 4

**Alternative A5 -- Reduce Funding for Supplemental Payments
Maintain \$300 OWI Surcharge**

	<u>1996-97</u>	<u>1997-98</u>	<u>1998-99</u>
Opening Balance	\$2,646,600	\$2,578,200	\$789,400
Revenues			
Base Estimate	\$1,833,900	\$2,044,000	\$2,044,000
Maintain \$300 Surcharge	0	0	0
Subtotal	<u>\$1,833,900</u>	<u>\$2,044,000</u>	<u>\$2,044,000</u>
Total Available	\$4,480,500	\$4,622,200	\$2,833,400
Expenditures			
DHFS -- Supplemental Funds	\$175,100	\$500,000	\$500,000
DHFS -- Emergency Funds	8,200	0	0
DOJ*	72,800	39,300	39,300
DPI*	450,400	225,200	225,200
DOT--Breath Testing Equipment	0	1,990,400	0
DOT --Chemical Test Section	0	444,200	888,300
UW*	1,195,800	633,700	639,700
Subtotal	<u>\$1,902,300</u>	<u>\$3,832,800</u>	<u>\$2,292,500</u>
Projected Closing Balance	\$2,578,200	\$789,400	\$540,900

To: Joint Committee on Finance
From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE**Domestic Violence Programs (DHFS -- Children and Family Services and Supportive Living)**

[LFB Summary: Page 326, #32]

CURRENT LAW

Both the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) and the Office of Justice Assistance (OJA) provide funds for services related to domestic violence. DHFS provides funding to prevent domestic violence and services for victims of domestic violence. OJA receives two federal grants to enhance effective law enforcement and prosecution of crimes against women and provide services to victims of domestic violence.

DHFS Domestic Violence Programs. In calendar year 1997, DHFS allocated \$4,232,100 (all funds) as ongoing support for local domestic violence programs and allocations to counties and Native American tribes, specialized domestic violence services and other domestic violence services.

Federal funding is available under the family violence prevention and service grant program administered by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. PR funding is collected from a \$50 charge assessed on individuals convicted of domestic violence offenses.

Local Domestic Violence Programs. DHFS allocates funds for grants to public and private organizations to provide: (a) shelter facilities or private home shelter care; (b) advocacy and counseling; (c) 24-hour telephone service; and (d) community education. If an organization provides shelter facilities or private home shelter care, the organization is required to provide the following additional services: (a) temporary housing and food; (b) referral and follow-up services; (c) arrangement for the education of school-age children; and (d) emergency transportation to the

shelter. Organizations are required to provide a 30% match, of which 10% can be provided through in-kind contributions. DHFS estimates that organizations generally receive about one-third of their costs from these grants. In 1997, 47 local domestic violence programs received a total of \$3,384,200 (all funds).

In addition, 30 counties and nine tribes have no local domestic violence programs. Attachment 1 identifies the organizations that received funding for local domestic violence programs in calendar year 1997. For these counties and tribes, DHFS provides funding for the county or tribe to provide some domestic violence services. In 1997, DHFS distributed \$365,000 (all funds) to these counties and tribes. Attachment 2 identifies these 1997 allocations.

Specialized Domestic Violence Services. In addition to the services identified above, DHFS allocated \$245,000 (all funds) in calendar year 1997 for specialized legal advocacy, transitional living and children's program services to victims of domestic violence. These funds were allocated to providers on a competitive basis. Attachment 3 identifies organizations that received funding for specialized domestic violence services in calendar year 1997.

Other Domestic Violence Programs. In calendar year 1997, DHFS allocated \$887,900 (all funds) for: (a) technical assistance (\$212,900); (b) programs serving refugee populations (\$25,000); (c) one-time funding to the Milwaukee Women's Center for a state-wide media campaign (\$205,000); and (d) one-time funding for equipment and technology purchases for local programs (\$445,000). Attachment 4 identifies the allocations to organizations for technical assistance, programs for refugee populations and one-time funding for a state-wide media campaign and equipment and technology purchases for local programs.

OJA Programs for Domestic Violence. OJA receives federal funding for two programs: (a) violence against women act programs; and (b) rural domestic violence and child victimization projects.

Programs funded by the Federal Violence Against Women Act. The federal Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) provides funding for states to develop and enhance effective law enforcement and prosecution strategies to combat violent crimes against women, and to develop and strengthen victim services. OJA completed a needs assessment in 1995, when federal funds first became available. OJA's 1996 implementation plan indicated that the total federal allocation of \$2,157,500 FED in federal fiscal year 1995-96, would be allocated in four program areas: (a) \$195,000 for enforcement and prosecution training; (b) \$950,000 for specialized enforcement and prosecution; (c) \$270,000 for police prosecution policies, protocols and services; and (d) \$742,500 for victim service programs. In federal fiscal year 1996-97, OJA received \$2,517,000 FED and is developing an implementation plan for these funds.

Rural Domestic Violence and Child Victimization Projects. The rural domestic violence and child victimization project grant is a discretionary grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Justice to increase the investigation and prosecution of incidents of domestic violence and child

abuse, provide treatment and counseling to victims of domestic violence and child victimization and develop education and prevention strategies directed toward such issues. A total of \$379,800 FED is budgeted for the eighteen-month period from January 1, 1997 through June 30, 1998. This funding will be distributed for: (a) increasing collaboration between state and tribal systems relating to child abuse and domestic violence (\$78,100); (b) providing services to migrant families (\$166,700); and (c) providing domestic violence programs for victims in counties that currently do not have a local program supported with DHFS funds (\$135,000).

GOVERNOR

Provide \$150,000 FED and \$90,000 PR annually for DHFS to distribute as grants to domestic violence service organizations to fund eight additional domestic violence programs in counties where such programs are not currently available. These programs would provide 24-hour phone service, advocacy and counseling services, referral and follow-up services and community education programs. This funding would be awarded on a competitive basis. The Governor's recommendations reflect: (a) reestimates of federal funds the state will receive from the federal family violence prevention and services grant program; and (b) increased budget authority supported by assessments paid by individuals convicted of domestic violence offenses.

As part of the federal revenue reestimate item, SB 77 would increase funding by \$373,200 FED annually for current grants to local domestic violence programs. Under SB 77, a total of \$4,744,000 (\$3,580,800 GPR, \$863,200 FED, and \$300,000 PR) would be provided to DHFS to support domestic abuse programs in each year of the 1997-99 biennium.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. In 1995, the state's domestic violence programs served a total of 25,313 individuals. Temporary food and lodging were provided to 8,017 individuals for an average of 14.1 days. A total of 1,843 individuals were not provided food and lodging because shelter facilities were full. DHFS staff indicate that in most cases, these individuals received referrals to other resources.

2. Currently, 30 counties and nine Native American tribes receive funding to contract for domestic violence services because there is insufficient state funding to support the comprehensive programs that are funded under the local domestic violence program. In 1997, these counties and tribes will receive an average of \$6,426 to contract for domestic violence services.

3. State law requires that organizations receive no more than 70% of their operating costs from state domestic abuse grants. DHFS estimates that organizations generally receive about one-third of their costs from these grants.

4. OJA will subcontract with DHFS for \$90,000 annually to fund three additional domestic violence programs from funds available under the federal rural domestic violence and child victimization project. DHFS intends to allocate these funds with the funding included in SB 77 to fund a total of eleven new programs in counties that currently have no program. SB 77 does not increase DHFS funding to reflect these OJA funds. Consequently, the bill should be amended to increase PR authority in DHFS by \$90,000 PR annually to reflect the transfer of these funds from OJA to DHFS.

5. The Council on Domestic Abuse requests \$420,000 in 1997-98 and \$840,000 in 1998-99 to provide \$30,000 annually for local domestic violence programs in each of the counties and tribes that currently do not have a state-supported local domestic violence program. SB 77 and the additional funds provided from OJA would fund eleven programs at \$30,000 each beginning in July, 1997.

The Committee could choose to provide \$294,700 GPR in 1997-98 and \$589,400 GPR in 1998-99 to fund local domestic violence programs in counties and tribes with no local domestic violence program. This funding reflects a reestimate of the cost to fund local domestic violence programs in each county and tribe currently with no program. Specifically, the Committee could require that DHFS redirect funding provided to counties and tribes that do not have state-supported local programs (\$125,300 in 1997-98 and \$250,600 in 1998-99), since these counties and tribes receive funding due to the lack of state-supported local programs in their county or tribe.

Funding for the Lac du Flambeau and Oneida tribes would not be redistributed, since these tribes receive sufficient funding to support a local program (\$57,200 in 1997-98 and \$114,400 in 1998-99).

6. In addition, the Council has identified other priorities that could be funded in the 1997-99 biennium, beginning in January, 1998. Specifically, the Council requests:

- \$117,000 to fund two local programs for under-served populations that cannot access domestic violence services due barriers of race, language, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religions, physical or mental ability, culture or geographic location;
- \$150,000 for a statewide program to provide services to under-served populations that reside in small clusters throughout Wisconsin;
- \$2,160,000 to fund 48 programs to provide services to children from violent homes to provide assessments, orientation, individual counseling, age appropriate education (including dating violence), referral, follow-up, support groups, safety planning and community education and outreach; and

- \$144,000 to provide additional funds for eight programs that currently provide services to children from violent homes.

7. Alternatively, if the Committee wishes to maintain current support for local programs and county and tribal allocations, it could reduce GPR funds currently used to support local domestic violence programs to reflect the availability of additional federal and PR funds to support these programs (\$240,000 annually). Since the \$90,000 which would be transferred to DHFS from OJA are federal funds awarded to the state based on a competitive process, the funds should not be used to replace current funding for local programs.

8. Total funding from the federal family violence prevention and services grant program would be budgeted in a federal project operations appropriation in DCFS. The portion of these funds used for providing domestic violence services should be appropriated in a federal programs appropriation for aids to individuals and organizations in DCFS. Consequently, the bill should be modified to transfer 0.575 FED positions and \$44,500 FED annually from the federal projects operations appropriation to the federal programs appropriation.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

A. Funding for Domestic Violence Programs

1. Modify the Governor's recommendation by increasing funding for interagency and intra-agency aids by \$90,000 PR annually to reflect funding transferred from OJA to support three additional local domestic violence programs. Total funding would be sufficient to support 11 new programs in counties and tribes that currently have no program.

<u>Alternative A1</u>	<u>PR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$180,000

2. Modify the Governor's recommendations by deleting \$240,000 GPR annually so that only three additional domestic violence programs would be funded in the 1997-99 biennium. Increase funding by \$90,000 PR annually to reflect funding transferred from OJA to support these three additional local domestic violence programs.

<u>Alternative A2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$480,000	\$180,000	- \$300,000

3. Modify the Governor's recommendations by providing \$90,000 PR annually to reflect funding transferred from OJA to support three additional local domestic violence

programs. In addition, provide \$589,400 GPR annually to reflect the net funding required to support local domestic violence programs in each of the 30 counties and nine tribes that currently do not have state-supported local domestic violence programs.

In addition, provide GPR funding for any of the following:

	<u>1997-98</u>	<u>1998-99</u>
a. Local Programs for Under-Served Populations	\$39,000	\$78,000
b. Statewide Programs for Under-Served Populations	50,000	100,000
c. New Programs for Children	720,000	1,440,000
d. Existing Programs for Children	48,000	96,000

B. Technical Funding and Position Adjustments

1. Transfer \$863,200 FED annually from the DCFS federal program operations appropriation to the DCFS federal aids to individuals and organizations appropriation and transfer \$44,500 FED and 0.575 FED position annually from the federal projects operations appropriation to the federal program operations appropriation to allocate funding and positions in the proper appropriations.

Prepared by: Rachel Cissne

MO# _____

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE _____ NO _____ ABS _____

ATTACHMENT 1

Local Domestic Violence Programs 1997 Allocations

<u>Agency Name</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Allocation</u>
Advocates	Saukville	\$74,363
Asha Family Services	Milwaukee	31,200
Association for Prevention of Family Violence	Elkhorn	41,979
AVAIL	Antigo	79,800
Bolton Refuge House	Eau Claire	93,458
Bridge, The	Menomonie	48,805
Cap Services Inc.	Stevens Point	104,000
Center Against Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence	Superior	62,400
Community Referral Agency	Milltown	79,800
Dane County Advocates for Battered Women	Madison	104,000
Family Advocates	Platteville	79,800
Family Center	Wisconsin Rapids	86,560
Family Support Center	Chippewa Falls	41,744
Family Violence Center	Green Bay	81,151
FAVR	Fond du Lac	62,400
Friends of Abused Families	West Bend	74,363
Greenhaven Family Advocates	Monroe	41,979
Harbor House	Appleton	72,904
Haven	Merrill	85,000
Help of Door County	Sturgeon Bay	57,871
Hope House	Columbia	17,500
Hope House	Baraboo	77,900
Janesville YWCA	Janesville	74,363
Lac du Flambeau Statewide Shelter	Lac du Flambeau	97,413
Manitowoc Co. Domestic Violence Center	Manitowoc	79,800
Menominee Co. Domestic Violence Program	Keshena	41,979
Milwaukee Women's Center	Milwaukee	104,000
New Horizons	La Crosse	74,363
Northwoods Women	Ashland	79,800
Passages	Richland Center	80,379
PAVE	Beaver Dam	62,400
Personal Development Center	Marshfield	43,160
Rainbow House	Marinette	85,832
Regional Domestic Abuse Services	Neenah	87,623
Safe Harbor	Sheboygan	72,904

ATTACHMENT 1 (cont.)

Local Domestic Violence Programs 1997 Allocations

<u>Agency Name</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Allocation</u>
Salvation Army	Beloit	\$36,544
Sojourner Truth House	Milwaukee	114,400
Stepping Stones Shelter	Medford	62,400
Timeout Family Abuse Shelter	Ladysmith	83,661
Tri-County Council on Domestic Abuse	Rhineland	84,638
Turningpoint	River Falls	92,530
Vernon Co. Domestic Abuse Program	Viroqua	31,200
Violence Intervention Project Inc.	Kewaunee	41,184
Women's Center	Waukesha	104,000
Women's Community	Wausau	87,367
Women's Horizons	Kenosha	74,363
Women's Resource Center	Racine	<u>88,910</u>
Total		\$3,384,190

ATTACHMENT 2

County and Tribal Domestic Violence Services 1997 Allocations

<u>County</u>	<u>Allocation</u>	<u>Tribe</u>	<u>Allocation</u>
Adams	\$3,225	St. Croix	\$3,500
Barron	5,000	Lac Courte Oreilles	3,500
Bayfield	6,000	Red Cliff	3,500
Buffalo	3,000	Sokaogon	3,500
Burnett	3,000	Potawatomi	3,500
Calumet	5,000	Stockbridge-Munsee	3,500
Clark	1,500	Oneida	40,365
Crawford	4,500	Bad River	10,000
Florence	2,666	Lac du Flambeau	74,000
Forest	3,360	Menominee	3,500
Green Lake	5,500	Ho-Chunk	<u>3,500</u>
Iowa	3,000	Subtotal	\$152,365
Iron	4,000		
Jackson	10,000	Increases to be distributed to	
Jefferson	10,000	counties in 1997	<u>\$49,800</u>
Juneau	9,524		
Lafayette	5,000	Total 1997 Funding to	
Marquette	500	Counties/Tribes	\$364,989
Monroe	11,300		
Oconto	7,500		
Pepin	2,710		
Price	10,000		
Sawyer	3,000		
Shawano	3,000		
St. Croix	6,000		
Trempealeau	7,000		
Vilas	5,520		
Washburn	750		
Waupaca	10,000		
Waushara	<u>11,269</u>		
Subtotal	\$162,824		

ATTACHMENT 3

Specialized Domestic Violence Services 1997 Allocations

<u>Agency Name</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Allocation</u>
Children's Programs		
Bridge, The	Menomonie	\$19,590
Cap Services Inc.	Stevens Point	20,000
Community Referral Agency	Milltown	7,006
Lac du Flambeau Statewide Shelter	Lac du Flambeau	20,000
Manitowoc Co. Domestic Violence Center	Manitowoc	20,000
Milwaukee Women's Center	Milwaukee	20,000
Regional Domestic Abuse Services	Neenah	18,404
Women's Resource Center	Racine	<u>20,000</u>
Subtotal		<u>\$145,000</u>
Legal Advocacy		
Association for Prevention of Family Violence	Elkhorn	\$14,900
Help of Door County	Sturgeon Bay	15,100
Wisconsin Coalition Against Domestic Violence		<u>20,000</u>
Subtotal		<u>\$50,000</u>
Transitional Living		
Bolton Refuge House	Eau Claire	\$14,190
Northwoods Women	Ashland	20,000
Passages	Richland Center	<u>15,810</u>
Subtotal		<u>\$50,000</u>
Total Specialized Domestic Violence Services		\$245,000